

growth is about 5.2 percent. There was a large concern and they wanted to put the nutrition programs in with the welfare block grant.

As the subcommittee chairman, I determined that if we did that, we would hurt those nutrition programs. So I separated the school breakfast and the school lunch program and guaranteed that 80 percent of it would be spent on the most needy children, those children, 185 percent and below poverty level. That protected those.

The States and the Governors also wanted a 20 percent remaining to be flexible, that they could either add, if that particular State needed it, to the school breakfast or school lunch program or other nutritional programs. For example, what may work for Tommy Thompson in Wisconsin may be a little bit different than Governor Wilson of California, but it gives them the flexibility. We increased the spending level by 4.9 percent.

I would like to submit this chart also for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker. It shows incrementally, for example, in 1995, for the school breakfast program, it was \$4.59 billion. In 1996, it is \$4.7. In 1997, it is 4.9. In 1998, it is 5.1. And in 1999, it is 5.4. And in the year 2000, it is 5.6. As you can see, each year we have increased spending for the school breakfast and lunch program. Also for the Women, Infants and Children Program that we have increased funding and, again, if we would have block granted it with the welfare block grants, it would have been in competition and I protected it.

[Chart not reproducible in the RECORD.]

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I also mandated that 80 percent of the funds in that block grant must go to the WIC Program. And the 80 percent funding is more money than current law gives to the WIC Program. Why? Because the WIC Program in California and most States across the country is very effective and it is the Women, Infants and Children Program.

For example, currently it is 3.5. In 1996, under our block grant, it goes to 3.7, this is from 3.5. That is not a cut, my colleagues. In 1997, it is 3.8; in 1998, it is 4.0; 4.1 in 1999, and in the year 2000, 4.2, nearly 4.3. That is not a cut.

I would like to submit this for the RECORD also, Mr. Speaker.

What the other side would have you believe is that we are actually trying to kill and cut children's nutrition programs. It is not true. The Governors came to us and said there was 366 welfare programs, very noneffective, if you look. And the American people understand that those programs have failed. The monumental paperwork, the Government bureaucracy, the reporting documents. I listened to State Senator Hoffer from the State of Colorado and he said they literally in the State have two full computer system programs and computers dedicated to just the reporting data of the children's nutrition program. We have eliminated that. We

have made it easier for the States to work. And so that we do not build State bureaucracies, we have limited the administration of States to 2 percent. In the case of WIC because it is more demanding, 5 percent. And what we are doing is getting the dollars to the kids.

We are growing kids, not Federal bureaucracies. I think that is important also. I included the language to make sure that the nutrition standards were maintained. But yet, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON], and the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], came and said, can we add language to ensure, even stronger language, that we maintain those nutritional levels? Both those amendments were accepted in the committee. They passed with bipartisan support.

But yet they still say we are killing the programs. Let me tell you what we are doing. We limit Federal bureaucracy, paperwork, increase local flexibility. We allow for the expansion of the children's nutrition programs. And that is a fact, Mr. Speaker. It is backed up with facts and figures.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the documents to which I referred.

[From the Washington Times, Feb. 28, 1995]  
DEMOCRATS "LIE" ABOUT LUNCH

(By Nancy E. Roman)

Democrats continued to spin the GOP's proposed "cuts" to the school-lunch program yesterday as "mean-spirited" and "cruel," herding a troop of preschoolers from Cheverly Early Childhood Center into the Capitol to make the point.

Rep. Steny H. Hoyer, Maryland Democrat, said if the Republican plan succeeds, it will "roll back years of progress."

Vermont Gov. Howard Dean, M.D., said it is "despicable" and accused Republicans of targeting nutrition programs for children because they cannot vote.

In fact, under the Republican proposal, the federal school lunch program will grow by 4.5 percent or \$203 million. In the current budget year, the federal government spends \$4.5 billion. Republicans would spend \$4.7 billion.

The "cuts" that have received so much press attention, refer to a reduction in the 5.2 percent average increase in the school-lunch program, as projected by the Congressional Budget Office. The GOP increase is 4.5 percent.

Rep. John Boehner, Ohio Republican and chairman of the Republican Conference, called talk of cuts in the school-lunch program "the biggest lie in Washington, D.C., this last week."

"What we're doing is guaranteeing that states will get more money," he said.

Republicans propose to spend 4.5 percent more on school lunches in 1996—an average of 4 percent more every year for the next five years. They hope that by eliminating federal paperwork, the states will be able to serve even more free and subsidized lunches.

"If they [the governors] can't take more money and do a better job, they should step down," said Rep. Bill Goodling, Pennsylvania Republican and chairman of the committee that crafted the bill.

The failure to get that message out fore-shadows the trouble Republicans face when they get to real cutting necessary to balance the budget.

"It points out the job we are going to have to do in going over the heads of special-interest groups who want to portray whatever we do as a cut," said Brian Cuthbertson, press secretary for Rep. John Kasich, chairman of the House Budget Committee.

He said he routinely explains to reporters that even after budget cuts, some programs will grow.

"I had to explain that to a local reporter from Columbus, Ohio, on Friday," he said. "I said, 'Would it surprise you to learn that it is not being cut? That we are going to spend more on school lunches?'"

The reporter said "Oh," Mr. Cuthbertson recalled.

"Let's focus on facts," Rep. Steven Gunderson, Wisconsin Republican and welfare-reform point man, said when House Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee was marking up its welfare reform last week. The "toughest accusation" that can be made about the block-grant approach "is that it reduces growth."

Mr. Hoyer said because of an expected increase in children using the school lunch program, a 4 percent increase in overall spending amounts to a cut.

The Democrat barrage continued yesterday with Donna E. Shalala, secretary of health and human services, telling members of the American Public Welfare Association conference: "Cruel is the only way to describe provisions that would abolish nutrition programs for children, deny benefits to children of teen mothers, and reduce assistance to thousands of abused, neglected and abandoned children."

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, South Dakota Democrat, said he, too, is appalled.

"How ironic that in the name of reducing the debt on our children, we take their meals instead," he said.

Ed Gillespie, spokesman for House Majority Leader Dick Army, said it has been difficult to counter the Democratic assault on the Republican bill as stealing food from the mouths of children.

"I don't know what else you can do when the Democrat Party has a concerted strategy to lie to the American people other than to tell the truth," he said.

□ 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. HOYER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

IN MEMORY OF SHAWN LEINEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCINNIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you to advise the House of news that another police officer has fallen in the line of duty. The officer, Shawn Leinen, was 27 years old and married to Susan Leinen, who is 6 months pregnant with their first child. Shawn was an officer with the Denver Police Department, and on seven separate occasions, he was cited for professionalism as an officer. He loved his duties and understood the risks, but always kept

the risk as secondary, having it overridden by protection of the citizens.

Shawn was brave, not foolish; Shawn was honest, energetic, and even praised by individuals whom he had previously arrested.

His death was senseless and as a former police officer, myself, it is hard not to feel deep bitterness and want for retribution against the 16-year-old kid who is now only a suspect. This death was not just senseless, but cold-blooded murder.

Shawn's widow, Susan, sits alone tonight, but she must know that Shawn's sacrifice, his call to duty, is recognized by the people who he protected. Their child will be born without its father, but will soon understand that dad was a hero. Our tears are in part for Susan's task in passing to that young child a response to the question, "Why?" Maybe our remembrance here in the Halls of Congress will assist in that effort. Maybe our thoughts and sympathies here in the Halls of the Capitol of this Nation will help Susan, as a policeman's widow, find some comfort in her days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, our men and women in blue have again suffered a loss, but in their loss their resolve becomes only more firm.

May God be with Shawn his widow, Susan, both their families and with that small yet-to-be-born child.

#### DEALING WITH AMERICA'S DRUG PROBLEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TOWNS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to talk about the Contract With America. As we look at the Contract With America, there is one thing that for some reason as I look at it and I examine it is left out. We have left out dealing with the drug problem. The drug problem is something that is not going to go away. We must address it.

As we look at what is happening in many of our urban areas and we look in terms of our prisons, we find that many of the people who are in prison have been involved in drugs. But at the same time for some reason or another, we do not want to spend the kind of money that we need to spend to be able to address the drug problem.

We have people who will come into our district offices seeking help, and we cannot provide help for them because there is no place for them to go because there are no funds available for them to be able to go and get treatment.

I recognize that there is no one solution to the problem and that we need to have several types of treatment programs, but for some reason we have sort of ignored this problem.

I know that some districts have a greater problem than others, but I think the time has come when we need to look at what is happening in the

United States of America and that regardless of where you are in terms of your district, if you have the problem now, I think you need programs to begin to work with it. And for some reason you do not have it, I would like to say to you, "It's coming. It's on its way to you right now."

I would hope that the people who do not have the problem would come and rally with the people who do have the problem to begin to come up with some solutions to the drug addiction problem.

We are spending a lot of money on the back end that if we would address this problem on the front end, we would not have to spend the money on the back end.

It costs a lot of money to keep a person in prison, when we could spend the money to be able to detoxify a person and to be able to assist them in terms of counseling and to hope to put them back on the road to work.

We talk about welfare reform, we talk about health care reform, we talk about all the different types of reform, but at the same time we still do not spend the kind of time talking about dealing with the drug problem.

The Speaker came up with an idea, and I must admit that I like the idea very, very much, that he is going to encourage Members from various districts to go and visit other districts. In other words, he is going to encourage people from the rural areas to go into the urban areas and to visit those areas. I think that is an excellent idea and I think that is one that should take place and should take place right away, because I think that there are some Members in the House that do not realize what is happening in some of the urban areas. That is the reason why that sometimes that when you feel that you need support, that you are not getting support, that they do not understand the problems you are having in those areas.

I am hoping that people in the urban areas will go into the rural areas and take a look at what is happening there and be able to give the assistance that needs to be given in the rural areas.

America is not the same. It is different in terms of its regions. The cost of living, when we talk about wages and we talk about increasing the minimum wage. Some people say, "Well, it's not necessary." But then if you come from a high cost-of-living area, it is very necessary.

I think that we have to sit down, take a look at where we are to begin to address some of these problems. I think that the best way to do it would be able to look at this drug problem and say, "Well, let's face it, there is a region that has a serious problem. We're going to give them the necessary resources to be able to address the problem and to be able to help them to be able to work it through." Because if not, eventually they would have to incarcerate the person and it would cost a whole lot more.

Recognizing that there is a dispute going on about the best possible treatment for addicts, I understand that. But I think that the treatment that the person will respond to is the kind of treatment that we should be able to get them into.

Some people say the methadone maintenance program does not work. There are some people who have responded to the treatment of methadone maintenance, and if they have responded to it, I think we should work it out where we would have funds available to set up programs for people that could benefit from that particular treatment.

Then I think the drug-free program, some people can benefit from that. I think that we should be able to set it up where they can go into that. Then if they need cycloazine or whatever it is to be able to provide the kind of treatment they need, that we should be able to provide that care for them.

I think the worst thing in the world that is happening now, that for an addict to walk into a facility and say, "I would like to be treated," and then after you talk to them, you find out that a waiting list of a year, a year and a half, or 2 years.

My goodness, what will happen to a person who has to wait to get treatment, to get care for 2 years? I think the time has come when we should roll up our sleeves and be able to provide the kind of necessary care for people that have those problems.

#### TRIBUTE TO AFRICAN-AMERICANS DURING BLACK HISTORY MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FRANKS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, the following is my tribute to African-Americans during Black History Month.

At one time teaching a black child how to read was against the law. For blacks to congregate other than for church was against the law. For blacks to vote was against the law. Our forefathers proved their imperfection by claiming that blacks were not to be counted as full human beings.

Just 40 plus years ago, the separate-but-equal schools debate was going on which led to the historic desegregation of our schools. Terms like inferior, discrimination, States rights, racism, segregation, civil rights were part of the lingo of the past, or are they, Mr. Speaker?

States rights. States argued that if they did not want to treat a black child fairly, it was fine. If a State wanted blacks to use separate water fountains, it was fine. If a State wanted blacks to use separate lavatories, it was fine. Thanks to the Federal Government, we have come a long way.